

# **Interview Summary**

**Application No.**

09/481,990

**Applicant(s)**

LESAGE ET AL.

**Examiner**

Robert Landsman

**Art Unit**

1647

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Robert Landsman.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Paul Carango.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 04 October 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: all pending.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: discussed the scope of claim 27 and proposed amendment to be submitted. Rejection of claims 11, 27 and 28 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, appear to be clear in view of attorney's arguments and the specification regarding weak inward rectifying potassium channels being defined and well-known in the art. Rejection of claims 11, 27 and 28 under 35 USC 101 appears to have been overcome in view of the fact that the derivatives of SEQ ID NO:2 can be used for drug screening..